

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

BECKLEY DIVISION

MICHAEL TRAVIS HINKLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:10-cv-01086

VICKI GREENE, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

The Court has reviewed the Plaintiff's *Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs* (Document 1) and *Complaint* (Document 3) brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

By *Standing Order* (Document 4) entered on September 10, 2010, this action was referred to the Honorable R. Clarke VanDervort, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this Court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On July 2, 2013, the Magistrate Judge submitted his *Amended Proposed Findings and Recommendation*¹ (Document 22). Therein, it is recommended that this Court deny the Plaintiff's *Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs* (Document 1), dismiss the Plaintiff's *Complaint* (Document 3), and remove this matter from the Court's docket.

¹ On June 12, 2013, the Magistrate Judge submitted his initial *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* (Document 19) to which the Plaintiff timely objected. As a result of the objections, the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings were amended on July 2, 2013.


Objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Amended Proposed Findings and Recommendation* were due by July 19, 2013.

Neither party has timely filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Amended Proposed Findings and Recommendation*. The Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984).

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** and incorporates herein the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the *Amended Proposed Findings and Recommendation*, and **ORDERS** that the Plaintiff's *Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs* (Document 1) be **DENIED**, that the Plaintiff's *Complaint* (Document 3) be **DISMISSED**, and that this matter be **REMOVED** from the Court's docket.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a certified copy of this Order to Magistrate Judge VanDervort, counsel of record, and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: July 23, 2013


IRENE C. BERGER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA